tion, are full of original ideas, and evince a perfect knowledge of the capabilities of form and colour. But we cannot so completely agree with other observations, which tended to an impression, somewhat differing from the first judicious advice. The capability of executing careful drawings ensures accuracy; the professor is himself a striking instance of the union of the skill of the artist with the requirements of the architect, and we cannot think the two abilities incompatible. If the advice was intended to refer *solely* to that very exaggerated style of colouring, which is practised in drawings that have to go before committees, we coincide with the truth of the suggestion, but without very clearly seeing the remedy. As long as people look more at blues and reds than at form and proportion, the present state will continue, and it will be necessary for such students, as have no immediate prospect of success in practice, to spend a portion of their time in qualifying themselves to meet the demand. Unfortunately for art, we are often compelled to make success, in the main aim of life, the most important part of the consideration.

Mr. Cockerell's remarks on the number of theories which lie hid in books, should give the impetus to those, who have the time to examine these and other sources. As our knowledge of such data increases, our presumed discoveries lessen in number, and it would be a labour which would repay the explorer, merely to re-discover and exhibit what has been found.

The most remarkable feature in these lectures was the change in Mr. Cockerell's opinions, on the subject of Gothic architecture. We must say, that the reasons of this change should have had the same force three years ago, which they have now. In 1843, the professor said, that proportions in Gothic architecture were "wholly capricious," and "subject to no order or regularity," nor that "any have been ever attributed" to the style by its greatest admirers; and that the delight, confessedly inspired by the works of the middle ages, is to be referred to a "love of the marvellous," which is "dangerous, exaggeration being the first sign of a mind indifferent to the value and beauty and sufficiency of truth, and the surest sign of deprivation of judgment." "The middle age church was wholly founded on superstitious associations."* These and similar views were subsequently combatted, and we have now the pleasure of finding the professor an advocate on our own side of the case. In the recent lectures the professor states, that there were principles of design, capable of explanation, but not appreciated by "modern Goths," and in another place, that no random or caprice entered into the principles of the style. Indeed, the whole course conveyed an impression, quite opposed to that in previous lectures. It has been urged repeatedly in these pages,† that a better system in the modern adaptation of Gothic architecture was demanded, and we are therefore able to concur in most of the professor's comments on the present state of taste. It was well said, that we must distinguish between design, and mere copying, and that we must avoid becoming partizans of particular styles, as we are apt to do.

We cannot assent to the statement, that the Gothic architects knew nothing of mathematics; we think that evidence will prove the reverse. Their constant love of geometrical forms is shewn in ornaments the most minute, and in the construction of their tracery, and the lectures are not without similar evidence. "The early architects," says Mr. Hawkins, "were certainly not ignorant of Euclid's works, which had been translated from Greek into Latin by Boethius. Cassiodorus had recommended Euclid to Theodoric, king of the Goths." But there can be no question of the unexampled skill, which their works exhibit, and if some of them have failed, there is no reason why we should not avoid such failures, possessing a better knowledge of the cause. The value of the principles is not necessarily lessened to us. In examining the theory of Gothic architecture from the plan, rather than from the ornament, the professor has acted only in accordance with the method he has often ably advocated, and which though at variance with ordinary practice at present, is the only proper method.

* *Vide* reports in the *Athenæum*, 1843.
† *Vide* Vol. III. *passim*.

Though Mr. Cockerell might have been directed to the account in Cæsarianus by Mr. Hawkins's book, published long since, and to which we do not think he has given sufficient credit, we are disposed to allow him the merit, which he claims for the elucidation of the particular method from the work of the commentator. Mr. Hawkins is certainly not clear as to the squares, and it would appear from some parts of the plan, that he intended the diagonal lines for the vaulting. That this *was* the system on which the Gothic architects worked, we do not think has yet been quite proved, neither can we admit that Mr. Cockerell has been the first to suggest a theory. Mr. Billings, Mr. Cresy, and Mr. Griffith have all preceded, and the system of the first, published in his book on the Geometric Tracery of Carlisle Cathedral, which was indeed referred to, is identical in principle with that of Mr. Cockerell. We were not previously aware, that the architects of the middle ages were in possession of the text of Vitruvius, but, at least, we cannot understand the proof that their style originated from that author. Cæsarianus may indeed have taken his illustrations from Gothic buildings, under the idea, that he was expressing the doctrines of Vitruvius, but Cæsarianus was not a Gothic architect, for he was the pupil of Bramante, and was contemporary with "Michael Angelo, the Florentine." This would be about the year 1520.—The explanation of Cæsarianus may belong to Mr. Cockerell, but similar ideas have been suggested by other parties; much credit is, however, due to him for the examples he has adduced. The professor is of opinion that the origin of the Vesica Piscis is greatly misunderstood, and that it was invented solely for the geometrical purpose of erecting a perpendicular upon a straight line. Although this reasoning taken *per se* may appear plausible, it is at variance with a great amount of argument on the other side. The occurrence of the form as a symbol in the earliest ages of the church, its constant recurrence in places, where it had evidently a symbolic meaning, and a want of accordance in the motive and use of the Vesica, inclosing the figure in one of the diagrams, and that which was drawn at the feet lead us to retain the old opinion, viz., that the fish was the ancient symbol of Christ, and that the letters of its Greek name were those which were afterwards abbreviated to I.H.S. The Camden Society have declared war against Mr. Cockerell, and perhaps he reciprocates the enmity. As we have not had an opportunity of referring to the book of Cæsarianus, we assume Mr. Cockerell has stated correctly, that the commentator indisputably refers to the Vesica Piscis, as inclosing the plan of the cathedral, for if there be any question as to the author's meaning, the merit of this discovery must be left with Mr. Kerrich.

As to the system of proportion by triangles, we believe that Mr. Cockerell laid no claim to the discovery of that method, as it was not only shewn in Mr. Hawkins's book, but also in the great work of D'Agincourt, which was reviewed in the last volume of this journal. As regards the proportions of Westminster Abbey, the height of which, compared with the width, is that of a church with double aisles, the question arises, whether at any period there was any intention of erecting additional aisles? Such an opinion, otherwise supported, would gain weight from the fact that, in the present aisle, there is a double row of windows, the upper range serving, in such an event, for the aisle clerestory.

The remarks on symbolism, and on the attachment to particular numbers, conveyed the impression that the professor recommended the like observance in future churches; and in speaking of the four columns and the three divisions in the "temple in antis," he appeared to have caught a notion from the Cambridge Camden Society, the influence of which we are not desirous to see extended. The evidence of the acquaintance of Sir Christopher Wren with the system of the Freemasons, has received confirmation from Mr. Cockerell. Some comments are made in another place on the retention of the spire, the rood-screen, the oblong plan, and other marks of middle age origin, and on the application of proportion by triangles to the west front of St. Paul's Cathedral, as illustrated by the late Mr. Bartholomew. To these marks of coincidence, others are now added, and it can never be forgotten, that in the construction of St. Paul's, Sir Christopher Wren made the greatest use of the knowledge of the Gothic architects. Mr. Bartholomew had also shewn the similarity in plan of Ely and St. Paul's cathedrals, though he was probably not the first, who had noticed it.

In reference to the last lecture, in which the professor gave a project for a cathedral, we need only say, that it was full of valuable suggestions, and matter for deep consideration. There was much, that it would be impossible to controvert. But an individual architect can do little to work a change. Styles of architecture have been the growth of centuries, and the produce of nations, and the influence of a single mind is seldom apparent. Truly, much may be done to improve present taste, and much is in the power of a professor whose talent is seconded by his zeal.

AWARDS OF OFFICIAL REFEREES.

The following are the heads of some recent awards which have general interest:—

CHIMNEYS ON CORBELS.

Mr. Hugh Cooper and the district surveyor of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, submitted a joint requisition, relative to a dwelling-house in course of erection on the north side of new Oxford-street, to the following effect:—

"Whereas it is provided in Schedule F of the Metropolitan Buildings Act, under the rule headed 'construction,' with regard to chimneys and chimney stacks, except angle chimneys, that the foundations and footings of every such chimney and chimney stack, must be built similar to those of the wall in or adjoining to which it shall be, and that every such chimney and chimney stack must be built from the foundation to the top thereof without any corbelling over, whereby any upper part of the brickwork of such chimney or chimney stack shall overhang any lower part of the brickwork on the front thereof, and that with regard to buildings of the second and third rates, the jambs, breast and flue in any single chimney may be built upon brick, stone, or iron corbels, above the ceiling of the second story of every such building.

And whereas in the party-walls of the said building (which is of the third rate), the said H. W. Cooper has erected above the ceiling of the second story on brick corbels, a single stack of chimneys projecting in part 4½ inches, and in part 9 inches before the face of the wall, the said stack of chimneys containing three fire places and flues.

And whereas the district surveyor objects to the said stack of chimneys as being contrary to the rules before referred to, inasmuch as the permission to build on corbels is limited to a single chimney, and is not intended to apply to a stack of chimneys."

The referees determined "that the permission in the said Act to build a single chimney, is confined to one fire-place and flue, and that it is not to be deemed to extend to any greater number than one fire-place and flue, but inasmuch as the official referees have reported their opinion to the Commissioners of Works and Buildings, that the rule quoted in the said requisition is inapplicable, and will defeat the objects of the said Act, and that by the adoption of a modification of the said rule such objects will be better attained, and further that the modification recommended, as it regards the point in question, is to the following effect:—'Nevertheless in any story above the first or lowermost story such chimney or chimney stacks may be corbelled out on each or either side of the wall upon brick, stone, or iron corbels to the extent of 4½ inches, if the wall from which such corbelling is made be not less than 13 inches in thickness, and 9 inches if the wall or the immediate substructure of the wall be not less than 17½ inches in thickness, but such chimney or chimney stack must be properly coursed and bonded with the structure of the wall in every course,'—I, the said William Hosking, with the assent of the said Arthur Symonds, defer to make any direction in the matter, until the determination of the Commissioners of Works and Buildings shall be made known on such report."

For a comprehensive guide on PDF Compression and OCR visit ThePaperlessOffice.org .